## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

		,					
Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	✓ Force	☑ Discourt.	. 🔲 U.S.	
Ariel Courage		Squad #6	201600468	☑ Abuse	O.L.	✓ Injury	
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL	
Thursday, 01/14/2016 4:00 AM	1	§ 87(2)(b)		101	7/14/2017	7/14/2017	
Date/Time CV Reported	<del>,</del>	CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:	: Date/Tim	e Received at CC	RB	
Mon, 01/18/2016 10:31 AM		CCRB	CCRB Call Processing System		Mon, 01/18/2016 10:31 AM		
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Add	Home Address				
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command				
1. Officers							
2. POM Michael Mccaffrey	10888	954111	101 PCT				
3. SGT Juan Quiroz	3694	939263	101 PCT				
Officer(s)	Allegati	Allegation			Investigator Recommendation		
A.SGT Juan Quiroz	Abuse: \$ 87(2)(b)	Sgt. Juan Quiroz entered in Queens.					
B.SGT Juan Quiroz	Discourtesy: Sgt. Juan Quiroz spoke discourteously to and Se7(2)(b) and						
C.POM Michael Mccaffrey	Force: PO Michael Mccaffrey used physical force against						

Force: Officers used physical force against §87(2)(b)

D. Officers

## **Case Summary**

On January 18, 2016, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via DIRAD message. On January 21, 2016, when contacted via phone by Intake, §87(2)(6) scheduled to appear at the CCRB on January 25, 2016, \$87(2)(b) missed this appointment without providing cancellation notice. On January 25, 2016, a missed appointment was sent to When the undersigned returned from vacation on February 1, 2016, a second letter was and a first email was sent to her. On February 1, 2016, the undersigned called § 87(2)(b) who rescheduled to provide an in-person statement on February 5, 2016. subsequently missed this second appointment without providing cancellation notice. As of February 17, 2016, \$87(2)(b) is not incarcerated. also filed this complaint on behalf of her son, § 87(2)(b) said that § 87(2)(b) resided with her at § 87(2)(b) did not have his own telephone number, and could be reached only through her. On February 1, 2016, a letter and email were sent to § 87(2)(b) through § 87(2)(b) mailing and email address. During the call on February 1, 2016, § 87(2)(b) said that § 87(2)(b) was not available to talk over the phone, but agreed to bring § 87(2)(b) with her to her scheduled appointment on February 5, 2016. Both and § 87(2)(b) failed to appear. On February 5, 2016, a missed appointment letter was mailed to § 87(2)(b) Between February 5, 2016, and February 16, 2016, four additional calls were placed to \$87(2)(b) number in an attempt to reach § 87(2)(b) each time, the undersigned either reached § 87(2)(b) who said it was not a good time for her to talk, or left voice messages requesting calls back. On February 11, 2016, a second letter and email were sent through § 87(2)(b) contact information. To date, neither nor § 87(2)(b) has responded to these contact attempts. As of February 17, 2016, is not incarcerated. also mentioned in her complaint that there were three other individuals who were involved in this incident and who, at the time, shared her address: \$87(2)(b) only as "§ 87(2)(b) but who was and an individual known to § 87(2)(b) identified by the investigation as §87(2)(b) Due to incomplete information from § it was unclear if § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were also victims of misconduct. On February 1, 2016, \$87(2)(b) was found to be incarcerated at \$87(2)(b) to his arrest in this case. On February 11, 2016 and February 12, 2016, the undersigned twice attorney, § 87(2)(b) requesting permission to interview § 87(2)(b) February 11, 2016, a letter was also mailed to \$87(2)(b) office. On February 16, 2016, the undersigned called \$ \$87(2)(b) office a third time and was informed that \$ \$87(2)(b) would speak to \$27(2)(b) on February 17, 2016, and would subsequently contact the CCRB. On February 17, 2016, see \$87(2)(b) contacted the CCRB and said he had spoken to \$87(2)(b) had no interest in pursuing this complaint. The initial complaint did not include any contact information for \$87(2)(b) an address, § 87(2)(b) On February 1, 2016, § 87(2)(b) said she had obtained a phone number for \$87(2)(b) but declined to provide it to the CCRB at that time, stating that she would provide it during her in-person statement on February 5, 2016, which she subsequently missed. As was discussed above, the investigation was never again able to reach §87(2)(b) after contact information for §87(2)(b) On February 5, 2016, and on February 17, 2016, a Page 2

CCRB Case # 201600468

Department of Corrections search confirmed that §87(2)(b) was not incarcerated. On February 5,
2016, a check of CTS revealed no prior complaints involving \$87(2)(b) On February 5, 2016,
and February 8, 2016, Lexis Nexis, COLES directory, and BADS searches returned multiple
possible addresses for \$87(2)(b) as well as multiple possible telephone numbers. Between
February 5, 2016, and February 22, 2016, five calls were placed to each of these numbers. Each
time, the undersigned either reached a busy signal, a non-working number, or an individual who
denied any knowledge of \$87(2)(b) s whereabouts or contact information. On February 5, 2016,
and February 15, 2015, please-call letters were mailed to each of \$87(2)(b) s possible addresses.
On February 8, 2016, a Department of Homeless Services request revealed that \$87(2)(6) was
not listed in their database. To date, \$87(2)(b) has not contacted the CCRB.
The initial complaint similarly did not include any contact information for \$87(2)(b)
aside from the same address, \$87(2)(b) On February 1, 2016, \$87(2)(b) denied that
she had contact information for §87(2)(b) On February 5, 2016, a Department of Corrections
search confirmed that \$87(2)(b) was not incarcerated. On February 5, 2016, a check of CTS
revealed no prior complaints involving \$87(2)(b) On February 5, 2016, and February 8, 2016,
Lexis Nexis, COLES directory, and BADS searches returned multiple possible addresses for
as well as multiple possible telephone numbers. In addition, on February 8, 2016, a
Department of Homeless Services request revealed that although \$87(2)(b) had not been active
in their shelter system since 2006, he and his family had contact with the agency in 2014, which
returned an additional address and telephone number. Between February 5, 2016, and February
22, 2016, five calls were placed to each of these phone numbers. Each time, the undersigned
reached voicemail, wrong numbers, or numbers that were not in service. At only one of these
numbers, on February 5, 2016, did the undersigned reach a female who said she knew
but did not have any contact information for him, as she did not think he had a phone or
a fixed residence. When contacted a second time, on February 9, 2016, this female indicated that
while she had no contact information for ser/(2)(0) she had seen him around, and promised to
pass on the undersigned's contact information to him. On February 11, 2016, when the
undersigned attempted to contact this female again, the undersigned reached a voicemail box that
was full and could not accept messages. On February 16, 2016, the undersigned a fourth time
called this female, who confirmed that she passed on the undersigned's contact information to
On February 18, 2016, a fifth call was place to this number, and again reached
voicemail, which was again full and could not accept messages.
On February 16, 2016, NYPD documentation of this incident was received from the 101st
Precinct, which did not include any contact information for §87(2)(b) or §87(2)(b)
As on February 22, 2016, \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) are not
incarcerated.
§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)
·
Squad:
A

Page 3

CCRB Case # 201600468

Investigator:			
	Signature	Print	Date
Squad Leader:			
•	Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:			
	Title/Signature	Print	Date